



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PRINTED TEXTS OF THE PESHITTA OLD TESTAMENT¹

A critical edition of the Syriac Old Testament is not yet available. Hence, before one makes use of the Peshitta for the textual criticism of the Bible, one must endeavor first to verify the correctness of its text. The means for that purpose accessible in print are the following editions:

I. *Biblia polyglotta Parisiensia*, Michaelis Le Jay. Lutetiae 1629–1645 = \mathfrak{S}^P .

II. *Biblia sacra polyglotta Londinensia*, Briani Walton. Londini 1657 = \mathfrak{S}^W .

III. *Vetus Testamentum Syriace . . . iussu societatis biblicae recognovit et ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum, edidit* Samuel Lee. Londini 1823 = \mathfrak{S}^L .²

IV. *Vetus Testamentum Syriace et Neosyriace*. Urmia 1852 = \mathfrak{S}^U .

V. *Biblia sacra iuxta versionem simplicem, que dicitur Pschitta* (3 vols.). Mausili 1887–1891 = \mathfrak{S}^M .³

The *editio princeps* was prepared by Gabriel Sionita (a Maronite, b. 1577 at Edden on the Lebanon; d. 1648 at Paris) for the Great Paris Polyglot published by M. Guy Michel Le Jay in 1645. It is the basis of the several subsequent editions. Sionita aimed not only at editing the Peshitta but producing as nearly as possible a complete Bible in Syriac.⁴ In combining, as he did, versions by different hands and of different ages, he followed the example of the Greek-speaking churches, which from the second or third century have included Theodotion's version of Daniel in the LXX;⁵ and the insertion of extraneous matter that he had practiced has been followed by all succeeding writers. Concerning the preparation of Sionita's edition we have but little knowledge. Sionita, despite his excellent qualifications in Syriac learning, "did not apply himself industriously, and was even accused, apparently with some show of reason, of carelessness in the work."⁶ He is, indeed, charged by scholars to be untrustworthy and yet they are indebted to him for giving an apparatus of vowels and other points which

¹ The sigla used for the various printed editions of the Syriac Bible are those employed in Kittel's Hebrew Bible, while those for the Peshitta MSS are taken from Barnes's *Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version*. Cambridge, 1897.

² The same edition was reissued in 1824 with some slight changes. As to wherein one differs from the other, see Nestle in *ZDMG*, LIX (1905), 31–32.

³ A second edition without any alteration in the text but differing in size was issued in 1888–92 and subsequently two reprints were made.

⁴ Sionita's contribution to the Paris Polyglot is his revision and correction of almost all Syriac and Arabic texts, and the translation of the Arabic and Syriac texts into Latin, with the exception of the Book of Ruth, which is the work of Abraham Ecchelensis (a Maronite born in a village on the Lebanon in 1600; died at Rome in 1664), who also prepared III Macc. in Arabic and the Latin translation thereof. See London Polyglot, I, Proleg. XIII, 89a.

⁵ See Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 64 ff.

⁶ J. P. Arendzen in *Catholic Encycl.*, VI, 331b.

his successors have for the most part adopted. The fact that the system of vocalization introduced into the Syriac of the Paris Polyglot was partly, at least, an innovation introduced by Gabriel Sionita must be borne in mind by those who used either the Paris or the London Polyglot; for in many words there is a redundancy of vowels and the forms of some are not always consistent.

By some singular irony of fate, Gabriel Sionita used as the main authority for his text that MS¹ which seems to be the worst of all known MSS of the Peshitta and which, according to Barnes,² "was unfortunate both in its birth and in its bringing up. From the first it contained more errors due to homeoteleuton than any other of the MSS here cited; and it was afterward revised by an editor³ who made corrections in the text and supplied omissions in the margin on a large scale often without any manuscript authority whatsoever." The claim⁴ that Sionita supplied missing portions by translating from the Latin Vulgate cannot be substantiated. It seems, rather, that the additions were really translated from the Hebrew, or else brought in from some parallel place in the Syriac. The corrections are often assimilations to our present Hebrew text. Obviously such additions and corrections can have very little authority. As Barnes⁵ well pointed out, a comparison with other MSS shows that his codex is of no value whatsoever. It persistently disagrees with the older MSS which are available now, and very frequently its editorial readings stand absolutely by themselves.⁶ It is, however, also possible that this codex is the only surviving representative of an otherwise lost family of ancient lineage; but such a hypothesis is of necessity barren of proof. The two facts upon which we have to rely are that this codex is a MS of the seventeenth century and that it differs widely in text from many MSS known to be ancient. Gabriel Sionita's chief MS, being of so little value, seems to have been used only because it was convenient for the printers to handle. The text printed from it is quite unsatisfactory. It varies from the oldest MSS in many respects, particularly in the following four points: (a) in agreeing with the Hebrew when the other MSS disagree; (b) in disagreeing with the Hebrew where they agree; (c) in omitting many clauses and some passages of length which they contain; (d) in using later forms where they give classical forms of words. That this MS is of a late date was already suspected by Samuel Lee. In 1821, speaking

¹ Codex Syriac 6 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. This was not the only MS used for the text of the Paris Polyglot; see Barnes, *App. Crit.*, p. 20.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

³ Zotenberg (*Catalogue*, p. 22) strangely identifies this editor with E. Renaudot (born 1646), while asserting that this MS was used for the Paris Polyglot of 1645. It is clear that "Syriac 6" was edited for the press and that the editor's notation corresponds with the notation of the folios and columns of the Paris Polyglot.

⁴ J. A. Edgren in *Hebrew Student*, I (1882), 12.

⁵ *Expository Times*, IX (September, 1898), 560.

⁶ Cf. Barnes, *App. Crit.*, pp. xvi f.

of a MS belonging to Dr. Adam Clarke, Lee asserted¹ that "it agrees mostly however with Ussher and Pococke, and with the printed text, which leads me to suppose that the manuscript from which Gabriel Sionita took the text of Le Jay's *Polyglot* . . . must have been one of a modern date."

In 1657 Bishop Brian Walton, in the London Polyglot, reproduced "without any improvement"² the text of the Peshitta of the Paris Polyglot. In his Prolegomena (p. 89*b*), Walton censures Gabriel Sionita for the imperfect condition of the Syriac text and its Latin version in the Paris Polyglot. He contents himself, however, with merely reprinting these, adding some apocryphal books translated from the Greek and placing Herbert Thorndyke's collation of a few MSS in the sixth volume of the Polyglot. Walton promised to re-edit the text of the Peshitta, and evidently it was for this purpose that Herbert Thorndyke drew up his *apparatus criticus* to the Syriac Bible. But this promise remained unfulfilled.³ Not only did Walton fail to take advantage of the several MSS brought to England by Archbishop Ussher and Pococke, which would have enabled him to correct the misprints of the Paris Polyglot, but he even allowed new misprints to creep in, in his edition. "The idea that the Syriac text which Walton reproduced was amended from MSS furnished by Archbishop Ussher⁴ and Pococke is a delusion, and as a matter of fact of the two Polyglots, the Syriac in the Paris edition is freer from typographical inaccuracies than is the London."⁵ Herbert Thorndyke's collation of the few MSS which were used by Walton for the sixth volume of his Polyglot contains many inaccuracies. Dr. Samuel Lee remarked that the MSS of Archbishop Ussher and Pococke were most carelessly collated by Thorndyke.⁶ Yet, despite all its defects, Thorndyke's collation is, for the present, the only existing *apparatus criticus* of the whole of the Peshitta Old Testament.⁷

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the British and Foreign Bible Society undertook the publication of a quarto edition of the canonical books of the Bible. This edition was printed in London, 1823, for the use

¹ See his "Remarks on the Collation of Syriac MSS" in *Classical Journal*, XXIII (1821), 247.

² *Ibid.*, p. 15. See also Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 81; Diettrich, *Ein App. Crit. zu P. zum Jesaja*, p. xiv.

³ W. E. Barnes, *Peshitta Psalter*, p. xxxi.

⁴ In the Prolegomena to this work (p. 165*b*) it is stated that Archbishop Ussher's MS was copied "from a codex of the Patriarch of Antioch," who is the head of the Maronites.

⁵ W. A. Copinger, *The Bible and Its Transmission* (London, 1897), p. 274.

⁶ *Classical Journal*, XXIII (1821), 249; cf. J. Rogers, *Reasons Why a New Edition of the Peschito, or Ancient Syriac Version of the Old Testament, Should Be Published, etc.* (Oxford, 1849), p. 8.

⁷ There are, however, in existence a number of critical apparatus to some single books of the Syriac Bible.

of Syrian Christians in Malabar under the supervision of Professor Samuel Lee. According to Cornill,¹ it is a mere reproduction of the text of the London Polyglot, which in turn is a reproduction of that of Paris. It retained very few vowels and these chiefly with proper names.

Professor Lee had a great opportunity to make the initial step toward the publication of a critical edition of the Peshitta. He had access to "B" the "Buchanan Bible" (Cambridge Univ., Oo. 1. 1, 2) of the twelfth century; to "p" (Bodleian Poc. 391); to "u" (Bodleian 141, Ussher's MS); and to "e" (Brit. Mus. Egerton 704). These four MSS each contains nearly the whole Old Testament, the last three being West Syrian MSS of the seventeenth century. Lee also had within reach "C" (Cambridge Univ., 1. 2. 4, written at Edessa, 1173 C.E.) for the books of the Prophets, and Gloster Ridley's MS of the Pentateuch, preserved at New College, Oxford. He had further at his command some MSS of detached books, late in date, but important as being of Nestorian origin, which Claudius Buchanan deposited in the Cambridge University Library. Lee was also aware of the fact that the Arabic version and the scholia of the Syrian church fathers, such as St. Ephraem, Bar Hebraeus, and Aphraates, were of value for the textual criticism of the Peshitta, and he actually made some use of these helps. The final results of his labor are very disappointing when compared with the wealth of material at his disposal. In the first place too large a number of misprints was allowed to stand, and in the second place Lee overrated the authority of Bar Hebraeus and accepted some readings for which, so far, no corroboration has been found in the ancient MSS but which seem to be simple emendations of the learned Syrian Father from Hebrew, Greek, and other sources. Barnes in his *Psalms*² noted many places in which Lee and Bar Hebraeus stand alone, against Codex Ambrosianus and all other early MSS, including those of Nestorian origin.³ But the greatest defect of Lee's edition is the want of thoroughness. Then, e.g., in the Prophets, many readings of the *editio princeps* are allowed to stand which could have been corrected immediately from Thorndyke's collation of C, p, u, in the sixth volume of Walton's Polyglot. Nothing was needed but a verification. The result is that Lee's edition contains a large number of readings which have practically no manuscript authority behind them. Barnes⁴ found this to be the case in Isaiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, and Chronicles. Cornill⁵ and Rahlfs⁶ are therefore not quite wrong in their assertion that Lee's edition is essentially a reprint of the text of the Paris and London Polyglots. The

¹ *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 139 ff.

² *The Peshitta Psalter According to the West Syrian Text Edited with an Apparatus Criticus*. Cambridge, 1904.

³ Cf. Rahlfs in *ZATW*, IX (1889), 166 ff.

⁴ *Expos. Times*, IXm, 12, 561.

⁵ *Ezechiel*, p. 140.

⁶ *ZATW*, IX (1889), 161 ff.

claim¹ that in Lee's edition we possess a critical text of the Peshitta based on seven MSS and on the commentaries of Ephraem and Bar Hebraeus cannot be sustained. Lee seems to have collated some MSS for his edition of the Peshitta,² but no such collation of those MSS has ever appeared in print, and this edition is of little critical value.

In 1852 Rev. Justin Perkins, D.D., an American Protestant missionary, issued a new edition of the Peshitta, printed in Urmia, Persia. It differs in many instances from that of the European editions and follows a great deal the authority of Nestorian MSS. It is a rather heavy quarto, printed in two columns, of which one contains the Peshitta text and the other a modern Syriac version made from the Hebrew. The materials were collected by Dr. Perkins during his residence as a missionary among the so-called Nestorian Christians of Persia.³ Nestorian Estrangela was used and the Nestorian system applied. The Peshitta text is fully pointed, and as regards text there is a great advancement on Lee's edition. It must, however, be remembered that this edition of the Peshitta is *not independent* of that of Lee. Some books, like Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, were little read among the Nestorians; consequently it can be presumed that of the Book of Chronicles Dr. Perkins did not obtain any MS.⁴ The result is that Chronicles in the Urmia edition simply "is a reproduction of \mathfrak{S}^L in Nestorian characters with Nestorian vowels and with improved spellings. Some of Lee's misprints are corrected, but no variation from \mathfrak{S}^L may be safely reckoned as a various reading based on manuscript authority."⁵ The same is probably true of some other books. But the Urmia text retains many of the imperfections of Lee's edition even in books for which Dr. Perkins certainly used Nestorian MSS. It is true that some of the readings which were adopted are now confirmed by early Jacobite MSS of which Perkins could have known nothing. Yet while the text of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel contains many improvements on Lee, it is marred by the retention of readings which are almost devoid of MS authority. Thus, e.g., in Isa. 16:1 \mathfrak{S}^u and \mathfrak{S}^m follow \mathfrak{S}^L in reading ܐܝܠܝܫܝܐ ("I will send") for ܐܝܠܝܫܐ or

¹ J. A. Edgren in *Hebrew Student*, I (1882), 12.

² *Class. Jour.*, XXIII (1821), 245 ff.; Hoffmann in *Neues kritisches Journal d. theol. Liter.*, I (1824), 149-61.

³ See J. Perkins, *Eight Years in Persia* (Andover, 1843), and Gwilliam in *Studia Biblica*, III, 55.

⁴ Rahlfs (*ZATW*, IX, 161 ff.) made the assumption that Nestorian MSS were used for \mathfrak{S}^u .

⁵ Barnes, *App. Crit. to Chronicles*, p. xv. Kamenetzky (*ZATW*, XXIV [1904], 194 f.) questions this assertion of Barnes's. The inferiority of the text of the Book of Chronicles in \mathfrak{S}^u admits of an easy explanation. The Nestorians and partly also the Jacobites excluded Chronicles from their Canon (Nöldeke in *Gött. gel. Anz.* [1868], p. 1826), and MSS containing this book were wanting at Urmia. Dr. Perkins therefore took Chronicles (Barnes in *Journal of Theological Studies*, VI [1905], 221, believes Ezra and Nehemiah also) from some printed text, either from that of the Polyglots or that of Lee and reissued it with a few corrections of small importance.

ܥܝܢܐ ("send ye"). Thus the printed texts, with one consent, suggest that the Peshitta agrees with the ἀποστελῶ of the LXX against the שלחך of the Massoretic text. The reverse, however, seems to be the case. Barnes¹ examined ten MSS at this passage with altogether different results. The best part of S^a is, according to Barnes, the text of the Psalms, being full of readings which are to be found in Nestorian and in early West Syrian MSS, but which are absent from the late West Syrian codices. Indeed, Barnes thinks "that for the Psalter at least S^a leaves little to be done except by conjectural emendation."² The text is not perfect, but it seems to be almost as near perfection as that of the best MSS.³ It may be agreed with G. F. Moore⁴ that "on the whole the text of the Urmia Bible is distinctly inferior to that of Lee and the Polyglots. The mere fact that it is based in part, at least, on manuscript authority, however, gives it a certain importance."⁵

The edition of the Peshitta published by the Dominicans of Mosul in 1887-91 contains both the Old and New Testaments. It was issued for the use of the Syrians, Maronites, and Chaldeans, through the efforts of the Syrian Catholic Archbishop of Damascus, Mgr. Clement Joseph David, under the supervision of the Chaldean Archbishop of Amid, Mgr. Gregor Ebedjesus Khayyath. Of all the available printed editions of the Peshitta, this is the most complete, beautiful, and handy. It is thoroughly vocalized, its print is very clear, owing to the use of beautiful Syriac type, and the paper good and lasting. It is therefore surprising that its existence is comparatively unknown. This, however, may be due to the fact that its value for the textual critic is very small, if any whatever. S^m was issued in the

¹ *Expos. Times*, *ibid.*, p. 561.

² *Ibid.*

³ Barnes, *Peshitta Psalter*, pp. xxxii f. The Urmia text of the Psalms is superior to Lee's, whatever early authorities, Nestorian or Jacobite, be taken as a standard of excellence. Even judged as a Jacobite text, Lee's is bad. The posthumous work of the great Dutchman Thomas Van Epre (Erpenius), given to the world in 1625 (*Psalmi Davidis Regis et prophetarum lingua syriace . . . versionem Latinam adject.*), is a far better representative of the Western text.

⁴ *Andover Review*, VII (January, 1887), 101.

⁵ The editors of this edition had access to ancient and valuable Nestorian evidence; but of the age and character of the latter, or of their own critical procedure, the editors seem to have published no account. Dr. Isaac H. Hall noted some facts regarding its publication. "It is absolutely certain that the editors made the MSS. they found in the region the controlling element in settling the text. Of these there were many as old as the twelfth century—scarcely any younger; and here and there one very much older. One was reported to be 1500 years old, which was used, but could not be borrowed. . . . It is easy to account for Dr. Perkins' silence as to the particular sources of his text, as also with respect to its peculiarities. It would not have done, at that time, for a man to have given any public prominence to text critical matters. . . ." (*Studia Biblica*, III, 56, note). It seems also that the editors were frequently guided in deciding between variants by the criterion of agreement with the Massoretic text, a course which, however natural in view of the practical purpose of the edition, greatly impairs its critical value.

interest of church politics. It was the purpose of its Catholic publishers to have it used by the Syrian church in place of the \mathfrak{S}^u issued by the American Protestant missionaries.¹ That it was published for practical purposes we have the testimony of Alphonse Mingana,² who himself had "revised and corrected" the four editions of \mathfrak{S}^m . This being the case, its value for textual criticism cannot be too great. Since the prefaces to the several volumes of \mathfrak{S}^m fail to give any account of the MSS used in the preparation of the work, Professor Sebastian Euringer applied to the Dominican missionaries in Mosul for information. In reply he received a communication from P. Bonte (dated March 17, 1899) advising that Mgr. Rahmani, who collaborated in the preparation of \mathfrak{S}^m , makes the following statement: "Quant à la valeur scientifique de l'édition Peschitta de votre typographie, vous savez que Mgr. David de bonne mémoire avait en considération les catholiques syro-chaldéens, non pas les orientalistes, et par conséquent il a préparé son édition sur celle de protestants et sur un manuscrit du XVII^{me} siècle, ayant aussi sous les yeux les textes hébreu, grec et latin."³

The printed editions of the Peshitta Old Testament thus far published can hardly be called critical, since their editors either lacked the necessary apparatus or did not consider it prudent to correct the received Syriac text according to the full light of their textual information. It seems that every copy of the printed text of the Peshitta both transmitted and increased errors. The texts of \mathfrak{S}^p , \mathfrak{S}^w , and \mathfrak{S}^L are generally allowed to count as one witness, because their differences are either misprints or improvements in spelling. Indeed, a mere glance at the differences in these three editions at once indicates that they consist of mere press errors and therefore cannot be considered as variants. Hence it would obviously be useless to regard each one as an independent witness. \mathfrak{S}^u proves to be substantially no better than \mathfrak{S}^L and \mathfrak{S}^m , having no independent textual value whatever. Thus the five available editions of the Peshitta Old Testament in print are practically reducible to one edition, so that the *editio princeps* still represents actually the present state of the printed text of the Peshitta. This being the case there can be no question that a good edition of the Peshitta with a critically revised text is a *desideratum*. It is indeed strange that no edition of the Peshitta has yet been published with that critical care on the part of editors which its antiquity and importance so urgently demand, though the need of it has been pointed out by almost all scholars who perused it.⁴

¹ Arnold Lazarus, *Zur syrischen Uebersetzung d. Buches der Richter* (Kirchhain, 1901), pp. 10 f.

² *Expos. Times*, XXVI (1915), 379.

³ *Biblische Studien*, VI (1901), 122 f.

⁴ Nestle in *PRE³*, Vol. III; Berg, *The Influence of LXX upon the Peshitta Psalter* (New York, 1895), p. iv; Gotthell in *JAOS*, XXXIII (1913), 263 f., and others. An edition of the Peshitta Old Testament was advertised some years ago from Berlin (Reuther and Reichhard) as in preparation by Baer and Brockelmann.

What are the prospects of such a work? The materials for it are not wanting. The amount and nature of manuscript matter are alike favorable for a revision. The case of the Peshitta differs from that of the Hebrew Masoretic text in that the MSS are not of one family only but fall into two important groups, the larger of which comprises the West Syrian MSS, the smaller, the East Syrian, consisting of Nestorian MSS.¹ Of these the latter seem to be more valuable because they show fewer signs of a revision of the Syriac from Hebrew² and Greek sources, which seem to have gone on for some centuries, culminating in the text of Codex F (Laurent. Orient. 58, at Florence). The agreement of the Western group with the Eastern is generally to be taken as decisive in giving us the reading which was most widely current toward the end of the fifth century, before the formal separation of the Nestorians from the Western Syriac-speaking church.³ It is safer to assume with Barnes that the agreement of typically Nestorian MSS with typically Western MSS in books freely received by Nestorians and Western Syrians alike is the best guaranty we can possibly obtain for the genuineness of any reading of the Peshitta.

It may generally be said that the number of good MSS is large. The British Museum, of course, stands supreme with its collection, for, besides a Pentateuch of the fifth-century and sixth-century MSS of Isaiah, Psalms, and other important books, it possesses a mass of MSS both of East and West Syrian origin, covering nearly the whole Old Testament and the Apocrypha. Italy possesses the great Codex Ambrosianus of the whole Old Testament, now made common property by Cariani's photolithographic edition.⁴ Berlin has two important Nestorian MSS. Cambridge has a collection of Nestorian MSS, two of importance, together with a good Edessene MS of the Prophets and the great "Buchanan Bible," containing the Old and New Testaments with Apocrypha, but sadly injured by time and by the climate of India.⁵ America, too, is in possession of a few important MSS, found in the Museum of the Union Theological Seminary, while Harvard University owns besides several other important MSS "an old and excellent manuscript of the Historical Books and the Wisdom of the Old Testament, of Nestorian origin."⁶

¹ This division was made already by Bar Hebraeus in his scholia on Ps. 10:5.

² Nöldeke thinks it improbable that the Peshitta was revised in accordance with the Massoretic text after the third century. See *ZATW*, XIV, 222, and XXIV, 186.

³ Rahlfs (*ZATW*, IX [1889], 163-64) has overstated the fact in saying that mutual influence of the groups of MSS is practically to be counted nil, "so gut wie ausgeschlossen," but cf. Barnes, *Expos. Times*, IX, 561.

⁴ *Translatio Syra Peschitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano* (Milan, 1876-83). Despite Cornill's unfavorable opinion (*Ezechiel*, pp. 140-54) this codex seems to be "the most valuable authority which we possess for the Peshitta text of the Old Testament" (Barnes, *App. Crit.*, p. xxi).

⁵ This MS was sent out to the Syriac-speaking Christians of the Malabar coast perhaps in the seventeenth century and was written in the twelfth century.

⁶ George F. Moore, article "Judges" in *ICC*, p. 67.

It is clear, then, that the labor before the next editor of the Peshitta will be very great, but the gain should be worth all the labor which can be bestowed. Barnes, on the basis of his own collations, came to the conclusion "that when all is done, when the best MSS have been used to the full, many readings will remain which will bear the appearance of corruptions of the original. We shall not obtain a perfect Peshitta, but we shall obtain one in which all the books will reach the high level obtained by the Psalter in S^u ."¹ But what we need is a text of the Peshitta restored as closely as possible to that which the Syrian church read in the fifth century or earlier, a text fit to take its place beside the best critical editions of the Hebrew original and its Greek version.

JOSHUA BLOCH

NEW YORK CITY

IVORY AND APES OF OPHIR

In *AJSL*, XXXVI, 103-19, Clark has placed biblical scholars in his debt by laying the ghost of an East Indian Ophir which still haunts our handbooks. Owing to a pardonable lack of acquaintance with the Egyptian material, however, he has arrived at wholly negative results where positive are attainable. I Kings 10:22, $\text{וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה}$ should be rendered: "ivory, *gp*-monkeys and *kyy*-monkeys." וְהָיָה is literally "tooth of elephants," Eg. ḥbw , and is identical in formation with the Assyrian compound *šinni-pīri*, "ivory," pronounced approximately *sinnipīr*, possibly the etymon of the puzzling סנפיר , supposed to mean "fin," but perhaps "tusk." The form תכיים instead of כיים^* (*kyy* occurs with *gp* in Egyptian texts) is, if the ת is not merely dittography, perhaps on a par with Ar. *timsāḥ*, "crocodile," from Coptic *emsāḥ*. The feminine article *t* with a masculine noun points to a loan from a very corrupt border jargon. Assyr. *namsuḥu* = *nemsōḥ* is a correct form with the plural article.

There can be little doubt that Ophir corresponds roughly to the African coast between Port Sūdān and Berbera in the Somaliland, Eg. Pwnt, which I have identified with Sumerian Meluḡa (see *JEA*, VI, 90-92).² The gold of Ophir presumably came from the auriferous region between the latitude of Esneh and Abyssinia (Reissner, *JEA*, VI, 79). The Rhodesian mirage has long since been dissipated, and the same is now true of Glaser's identification of Ophir with Hüsing's Hapirti, now known to read Hatamti = Adamdun in western Elam (Scheil, *DEP*, X, 2 f.). The Egyptian appearance of the word אופיר (cf. *Ūstr*, *Ostr*) points to a passage of the word through Egyptian mouths; the hieroglyphic form would be $\ast\text{ḥprw}$. The tree-name

¹ *Expos. Times*, IX (September, 1898), 562.

² It is quite unnecessary to include the peninsula of Sinai under the term Meluḡa, since malachite abounds in the Nubian desert, as I am informed by a mining engineer now working (June, 1920) in that region.